



Sally Thomas

03/03/2004 04:43 PM

To: (b) (6) >

cc: Renee Dagseth/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Monica
Tone/R10/USEPA/US@EPA

Subject: Re: Fw: Mail System Error - Returned Mail

10.1

Hi (b) (6)-

Thanks for your message. My colleague, Renee Dagseth, has looked into what options might exist for providing funding to support to the Citizens for a Clean Columbia's participation in the investigation of the Upper Columbia River (UCR) site. The following is a preliminary listing of what she's found:

1. Form a Community Advisory Group (CAG)

The purpose of a Community Advisory Group is to provide a public forum for community members to present and discuss their needs and concerns related to the Superfund decision-making process. Unlike a Technical Assistant Grant (TAG), **EPA does not offer grant funding** through this mechanism. This process is not tied to the NPL status so it is available to the UCR site. If a CAG were formed, EPA could provide funding (probably via contract) for a neutral professional facilitator, as well as pay for mailings and other publicity-related services. The Coeur d'Alene Citizens Coordinating Committee is a CAG-like entity which is working well at bringing together persons of diverse opinions. It relies heavily on the services of a facilitator paid for by EPA.

The CAG program is easily adapted to the needs of the site. Membership of the CAG can be formed in a variety of ways. One scenario could involve forming a panel consisting of EPA, State, local, and Tribal government representatives and other organizations. That panel could nominate membership of the CAG. EPA quickly could access 80 hours of facilitation via an existing HQ contract.

2. Technical Outreach Services for Communities. (TOSC)

The TOSC program could be used independently or in conjunction with a CAG. An OSWER grant supports a program which provides staff from Oregon State University and Stanford University to communities free of charge. The purpose of the TOSC program is to help communities understand complex issues associated with hazardous substance contamination. TOSC staff answer questions about potential health effects and possible cleanup technologies; assist communities as they interact with regulators; hold community workshops and provide educational materials about human health, environmental risks, and regulations; and, review and explain technical reports.

TOSC staff are unlikely to serve a long term role as technical advisors for the site therefore their input would be most valuable if it were provided in the early stages of the RI/FS process, helping the participants to frame the issues of greatest interest or concern and to understand where and how they can have the most influence.

3. Ecology Public Participation Grant.

The Department of Ecology does provide public participation grants however they are mid-way through their two year cycle and these grants will not be competed again until 2005. The Lake Roosevelt Forum is a current grant recipient.

4. EPA Technical Assistance Grant (TAG)

A TAG is not available unless the site is proposed for listing.

5. EPA contract support and Community Involvement Coordinator (CIC) support. EPA could direct its contractor to provide plain-English summaries of technical documents and to answer questions from community members. The CIC can also help with plain English fact sheets and with organizing meetings.

6. Outside funding. The EWCOG and community groups can look to the PRP or apply to foundations for grants for a technical advisor.

USEPA SF



1178746

(b) - I suggest that you to talk further with the Community Involvement Coordinator for this site regarding next steps. Once you've had a chance to review this list and discuss what makes most sense for the CCC, please let me know, and I'll get you connected with the right person.

Sally Thomas
(206) 553-2102